

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,245	YOKOHARA, TOYOAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERNESTO GARCIA	3679	

All Participants:

(1) ERNESTO GARCIA.

(2) Mr. Louis J. DelJuidice.

Date of Interview: 3 June 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 5, 10, 11

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Non-Final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 3:45PM

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. DeJuidice to place the case in condition for allowance. The examiner pointed out that "the opening" in claim 1, lines 15 and 19, lacked proper antecedent basis. Other issues regarded the clarification what feature of the large and small dimples render comparison. The examiner suggested amending the large and small dimples to recite that their diameter are different. The examiner called to clarify claim 3 as it was still unclear. Mr. DeJuidice explained the intent of the subject matter and the examiner suggested setting forth another tier of first dimples. The examiner also brought the attention that claims 5 and 11 are respectively identical to claims 1 and 10. Mr. DeJuidice agreed to cancel these claims. See examiner's amendment for changes made.